

02/04/02 MON 14:43 FAX 7051085397

USPTO AU-2415

802

Official



#1945/01

### Interview Summary

Application No. 09/167,988	Applicant(s) Lester
Examiner Rachelle J. Jentz	Group Art Unit 2102

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Mark Holland (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) Tara R. Hoff (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: Feb 4, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal (copy is given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: a) ☐ Yes b) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 69

Identification of prior art discussed:  
None

Agreement with respect to the claim(s): (a) ☒ was reached, (b) ☐ was not reached, (c) ☐ N/A.

Substance of interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Since claim 69 was inherently met by the last office action of paper number 18, any further prosecution will be  
regarded as non-meritorious.

Office Action

future office action  
dealing with  
claim 69

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office Action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side of an attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.